

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,806	04/12/2001	Akira Arai	9319A-000202 1937	
27572	7590 11/06/2002			
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 82 BLOOMFIEI	D HILLS, MI 48303		SHEEHAN, JOHN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	a
			DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002	7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			· M
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Interview Summary	09/833,806	ARAI ET AL.	,
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John P. Sheehan	1742	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, P	TO personnel):		
(1) John P. Sheehan.	(3) Mr. Bryant Wade.		
(2) Mr. Jason Heist.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 22 October 2002.			
·Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2)☐ applicant's represer	ntative]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-17</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: Funkuno et al., Hac	kman et al, Honeycutt and B	artlett .	
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reache	ed. g) was not reached.	h) N/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sh		ed to if an agreement w	as
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where n allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.	o copy of the amendments t		
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a checked).	a separate record of the sub	stance of the interview(i	f box is
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE F MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVICACION has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN O STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVICE OF SIDE OF THE INTERVICE OF THE INTERVI	EW. (See MPEP Section 71 NE MONTH FROM THIS IN	3.04). If a reply to the I	ast Office LE A
•			

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attached proposed amendment was discussed. The Examiner indicated that the amendment appears to overcome the rejections under 112 and 102 and the 103 rejections based on Hackman et al., Honeycutt and Bartlett. The Examiner took the position that although Fukuno is silent with respect to the groove width Fukuno teaches that the groove width appears to be a result effective variable (column 4, line 54 to column 5, line 13) and that the optimization of a result effective variable is obvious. Applicants pointed out that in all of the references including Fukuno (column 5, line 63 to column 6, line 6) the intent is that the molten alloy enter the grooves. Applicants proposed amending the claims to add language indicating that the grooves are of a width that does not allow the molten alloy to enter the grooves. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment may be persuavie but that he would reserve final judgement until such an amendment is submitted in writing and he has time to thoroughly consider applicants' arguments.